

# CAMDEN,

TUESDAY EVENING, SEPT. 16, 1851.

THO. J. WARREN, Editor.

## Party Strife.

We sincerely regret to see that our State is likely to be convulsed by party strifes and divisions, upon the question of action. It is a thousand pities that these miserable differences which now exist, should progress and be carried to the extent which we see is likely to be the result. Will some one who is able to answer, kindly inform us what good is likely to result from a heated, overwrought and protracted debate and contest, when it is obvious no practical good can possibly accrue from such agitations. We are not for sitting down supinely, and let every thing take its own course, but we are for using the means in our hands with great caution, that when we do work, it may be effectual.

We like the spirit of the meeting held in our Court House on the 1st inst., for the purpose of "uniting the two wings of the Resistance Party, and to prevent divisions among ourselves." The remarks of our worthy Senator, Hon. W. J. Taylor are in accordance with our views, and the whole proceedings have our unqualified approbation, and we think, display good judgment and common sense. The opposite of that, manifested by certain papers in this State, which have indulged their vituperative powers very considerably, at our expense, thereby exhibiting to our minds, a great deal of egotism, and a decided want of common sense. From such papers or such persons we have nothing to ask, hope or expect, and the least we have to do with them the better.

Col. Taylor, as Chairman of the meeting referred, to said, in the conclusion of his remarks: "I need not remind you, that we are all embarked in a common cause, a holy cause, and involving not only our rights as citizens of a common country—our property—our houses and firesides—but the very existence of our social and political organization. Shall we, in view of such things, halt on the way to squabble among ourselves about comparatively small matters? I hope not, I trust not."

"It becomes us to reconcile all minor differences which threaten to distract and divide us, or at least, endeavor to do so, and should we fail in the attempt, we will have the consolation of having discharged our duty."

We hope this meeting may be productive of great good in our District, and that our people may be induced to avoid the errors into which unfortunately, so many of our sister Districts have fallen. We are disposed to preserve, as much as possible, the equilibrium of our temper, and not disturb those friendly feelings which we entertain for those who are opposed to our views, so far as relates to the action of South Carolina. We see no good likely to result from trying to force others into a course contrary to their own predilections. For our part, we are clear for every man exercising his own opinion in his own way, and to suit himself, provided always, that opinion is within the bounds of decency and propriety, and has regard to the laws of the land. No man who does what he conscientiously believes to be right should fear giving offence to those with whom he may differ. We acknowledge the obligations which friendship often imposes, and the dictates of our better judgment frequently induces us to regard the opinions of others with respect, if not with admiration, even when those opinions are decidedly opposed to ours. We call no man *rabbini*—for the simple reason that General Jackson and John C. Calhoun were both men—and the frailties of human nature are attached to all who live or have breathed, or may breathe an existence in this world of ours. It suits us therefore, at this particular time, not to enter the list as a "turbulent son of liberty." Maintaining our Journal with our previously expressed opinions in every particular unchanged, we don't care (unless occasion should require,) to disturb the present quiet of our nervous temperament by a heated and animated discussion of a question which, to our mind, has been "used up," so, these many years, and upon which the whole English language has been expended.

## The Danger of Delay.

In our last, we referred to the case of the slave Daniel, who was arrested at Buffalo, N. Y., as a fugitive under the new law; and in which we endeavored to show the futility, not only of that law, but of the idea that some entertain of the good faith of the people of the North, as well as the absurdity of waiting for any concert of action on the part of the other States. The nature of that case, the result and all the particulars are before the country, therefore it would be time spent for nought, in dilating upon such a hack-nied subject as the Fugitive Slave Law. Our object is to call the attention of the people of our State, to the necessity of separating from a people so devoid of principle, or regard for compacts which they have sworn to perform in good faith. The people of the South are a very meek people, as we will proceed to demonstrate: they love their enemies; they are disposed to do good to those (of the North) who despitely use them, and persecute them; for in spite of their violations of the Constitution of the United States; in spite of their disregard, not to say contempt of our complaints; in spite of their attempts to overthrow our Institutions, by sending dangerous emissaries among us; in spite of all their aggressions, which are innumerable, there are still those among us, who have a contempt for every thing that does not emanate from the North; there are many who make their money at the South, only to spend it at the North; there are many, who imagine their sons cannot be gentlemen, or their daughters, ladies, unless their education is finished at the North, who, though owners of slaves, do not hesitate to pay the proceeds of their (the slaves) labour to the hypocritical Professors and Teachers of Northern Schools and Colleges, who, in their daily prayers, invoke the Deity, to destroy the very Institutions by which they are pampered and made rich; is this independent, is this con-

sistent? Who will say it is? The present commercial relations between the two sections must continue at least for some time—though some propose direct trade with Europe. Are the people of Europe any more favorable to our Institutions, than the people of the North? Call to mind when and where the agitation of the Slavery question began, and then answer: "out of the frying pan into the fire" is a very trite adage, but we can well apply it at this time, notwithstanding. It really seems as if we are not satisfied with the ill usage we have received from the rivulets and branches of Abolition fanaticism, consequently, we fly for refuge to fountain head—the process of annihilation is too slow in North America, England, though over-stocked with WHITE SLAVES must do the work, she is so much more expeditious in the abolition of negro slavery. What then may we ask, is to be expected from transferring our trade to Europe? This is a problem, time must solve; but we have digressed farther than we at first intended, and must return.

Our object in the outset, was to show as well as we could, to the people of SOUTH CAROLINA, the utter absurdity of waiting for Co-operation. Now for the proof: First we turn to the State of Mississippi—what is the state of affairs there? Quitman has withdrawn from the canvass for the gubernatorial chair, the Union Party has triumphed, so that no other candidate will now be brought forward by the Southern Rights Party, and Foote will be elected; in Georgia, the contest between McDonald and Cobb, is doubtful, and some already entertain fears of Cobb's election; in Alabama, Collier was re-elected, 'tis true, but there being really no opposition, we cannot say which party has the majority. From whence then, are we to look for Co-operation? we are not gifted with the spirit of prophecy.

Our little State now stands alone in her hatred of Northern aggression, and opposition to federal tyranny. Will not her sons sustain her in this proud position? many will, but some we blush to say, are willing to drag her to the portals of tyranny, and there, before the throne of the usurper and the aggressor, fall down and cry aloud "*we will submit, do with us what you will*." 'Tis a humiliating reflection indeed, but we cannot escape it.

We have already delayed too long, but we are not past redemption; if we have failed in our efforts to impress upon the other States, the necessity for action, and the importance of asserting and maintaining their rights and Institutions; if our warning has been in vain; if they will not aid us in preserving our common interests, they must take the consequences; we cannot lose sight of our own situation, nor must we longer neglect to use the means of deliverance which are yet left us. Some of our leaders have forsaken us, but we are not bereft; we yet have a few who know our rights; with these, let us maintain those rights; if we fail, then, and not till then, will we submit to our fate.

## Democratic Review.

We are in receipt of the September Number of this ably conducted Periodical; it is embellished with a portrait of Gen. Foote, and as usual filled with interesting reading matter. The General is a Member of the Democratic party it is true, at the same time there are many others much more deserving of a "place in a picture" than he is, but our lives are made up of looking first "on this picture and then on that." The work is published as usual, by Messrs. Kettell & Moore, New York, at \$3.00 per annum.

## For the Camden Journal.

## Where Stand the People of Kershaw?

Mr. Editor—It has been frequently asserted in the Editorial columns of the Journal, and also in private conversation, by gentlemen of considerable pretensions to intelligence, that it is useless and idle now, to attempt to shirk the responsibility, that the State and District are already pledged to separate State action, and that it is cowardly to attempt to recede. This assertion has been so often repeated, to the good people of Kershaw, that they are likely to be mystified as to their true position. We propose now, to consider this proposition, and probe it to the bottom, in order to see how much truth there really is in it, and whether or not this District is actually pledged. It will be needless for me to go into an argument to prove that this State is not pledged to separate action, because I believe this point is conceded by the Secessionists themselves. If such a pledge is to be found anywhere, it must be among the proceedings of her Legislature, but there is no such pledge to be found there. On the contrary, if there is any pledge at all, it is directly the other way, "*to co-operate*" with the other Southern States. The People have never been consulted about it—so it may be considered certain that no such pledge is in existence. The able letter of Judge Withers, published in the columns of the Journal, has rendered familiar to its readers, the train of argument by which it can be demonstrated to a certainty, that the State has not pledged itself in any visible way.

Are the people of this District pledged? If they are, it must be in one of two ways: either by their resolutions passed at the different District meetings which have been held from time to time, or by the election of separate State action Delegates to the Convention. And, first, let us consider the election. The candidates were five or six in number, nominated, it would seem, without any regard to their politics; but the Journal insisted on the candidates pledging themselves to separate State action, in the Convention, and finally, they were interrogated as to this point, by a correspondent of your paper, signing himself "BUFFALO." Now, I will not waste time in showing the absurdity of requiring men to pledge themselves in relation to a matter of which, at that time, they could not judge, and upon which they were to be elected to deliberate—because, in this free country, every man has a right to ask any question he pleases, and we have had some precious specimens of the exercise of this right very lately, in a neighboring District. I neither praise nor blame him for it. At all events, some of the candidates saw fit to reply, (Messrs. Lang,

Cantey, Shannon and Patterson.) Now remember, this was a test question: it was to decide whether the Delegates were to go for co-operation or not; its avowed object was to find who were the secession men; and who were for co-operation. The interrogator wanted to be answered without "*equivocation or doubt*."

And now mark the responses. First, Mr. SHANNON, in answer to the query, replied that he would unhesitatingly say, that if we had no hope of co-operation, that he was opposed to separate State action, still, under continued aggressions, he might be impelled to advocate it as a "*demerit resort*"—but if he is elected, he must "*go free and untrammelled*."

Mr. PATTERSON said, in substance, he was in favor of co-operation, and was willing to wait for it, and if we could not obtain it, then he was in favor of separate State action. "As to the time when South Carolina should secede alone, depends much upon future events, and I am unwilling to *embarrass myself with a pledge*, thinking it should be left to the prudence and sound discretion of those whom you may honor with your confidence."

MAJ. CANTLEY said, in substance—he was willing to wait a "reasonable time" for co-operation, if then it could not be obtained, he was in favor of separate State action; but goes on to say, "I wish it to be understood that I am to take my seat *untrammelled*, and act according to the circumstances that may exist at the time."

Mr. LANG said substantially—he wished for co-operation, but if it could not be obtained, he was in favor of Carolina's acting alone, and then in conclusion, says: "This is my opinion as at present advised, *not pledging myself* to any particular course of action, irrespective of circumstances that may arise affecting the expediency of the step." It will be seen, that not one of the four pledged themselves to separate State action—there was indeed a difference of opinion as to the remedy for our grievance between Mr. Shannon and the other responding candidates—that is not the point under consideration—and they all agreed in one thing, namely, not pledging themselves. There was plainly then no issue made. All the candidates that answered, stood all together—there may have been private pledging among the candidates—of this we know nothing. There, in the Journal, was the public refusal to pledge, and in relation to that matter, Messrs. Cantey, Lang, Patterson and Shannon, all stood by these answers, on precisely the same platform—that is, they tied themselves down to no particular course of action. It would have been ridiculous if they had.

The day of election at last arrived and past—nothing extraordinary occurred—all was quiet—there seemed to be no greater number of persons in town from the surrounding country, than we usually find on Bank day every week. In Camden, there were 207 votes polled, a little more than half as many as had been cast for captain of the Boat ten days before. There was not the slightest excitement among the voters of the District—many of them did not know that an election was being held—and did not know the object of the election (for very obvious reasons), and the great majority stayed at home without voting at all, and out of a District that in 1848 polled 806 votes for Clerk of the Court, but 364 votes were cast for Delegates to a Convention whose object, we are told, is to upset the whole government, and construct a new one for us and future generations! One of the boxes that in 1848 cast 109 votes for Clerk, at the election for Delegates to the Convention, cast only 8 votes!! And from one box in a populous part of the District, we never have had any return—we do not even know that the Polls were opened. I learn by diligent inquiry that the box was opened, and about twenty votes polled, and a return made. I however, can find no such return. Now is there a greater absurdity? Can any thing be more ridiculous, than for the Journal, in the face of this meager vote, when there was no issue presented, even to the few that voted, in the face of this partial return, to say that this District went for Secession! Yet the Journal announced the result as follows: "KERSHAW has planted her banner on SECESSION GROUND—Cantey, Lang and Patterson"—when I have just shown that these three gentlemen expressly declined pledging themselves publicly, and that not one half the voters of the District went to the polls. I think it can be clearly drawn from the above, that this District did not give an expression of opinion in favor of separate State action by electing Lang, Cantey and Patterson. No; not even did the 364 votes give an expression of opinion, for there was no issue made.

It seems to be plain Mr. Editor, that the District is not pledged to Secession by the election of separate State action Delegates, notwithstanding your confident announcement to the contrary.

In my next I propose to consider whether they pledged themselves by their resolutions adopted at their several District meetings. I hereto annex a statement of the number of votes polled last February, which owing to some cause, has never before been published:

Election for Delegates to State Convention.

Flat Rock,	46
Goodwyn's Store,	26
Liberty Hill,	33
Schrock's Mill,	8
Lysenby's,	21
Buffalo,	23
Camden,	207
Cureton's Mill,	000

Put Cureton's Mill as 20 and we have 384 KERSHAW.

## For the Camden Journal.

## To the People of Lancaster District.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—At a meeting of the Southern Rights Association of this District, held on the 5th inst., Col. Dixon H. Barnes, of your District, and Gen. William A. Owens, of Fairfield, were nominated as candidates to represent this Congressional District in the proposed Southern Congress. In submitting their names to you, we the Executive Committee are charged to address you on the questions of the day.

There is no difference of opinion in this District, as to the grievances of which we complain. They are in their character insulting and oppressive; so much so, that no people can sub-

mit to them and be "free and equal," or long remain independent, but soon, will become subservient, to powers, other, than those of their own choosing. The ablest man of the party opposed to secession says, "I feel humiliated into the very dust." This is the general opinion in South Carolina. We do not propose to dwell on the subject of our wrongs. All parties admit, they are sufficient to justify us in seceding, and taking "the separate station among the nations of the earth to which nature and nature's God entitle us." We only propose to discuss the remedy.

There are in this District two parties professing to resist the wrongs inflicted upon us—the so-called co-operation party and the secession party. Let us carefully but briefly examine the principles of these two parties, and see which is most likely to resist wrong, and sustain the ancient honor of the State, and "the peace, safety, and happiness of the people."

Secession from the Union is the remedy proposed by both parties; but the co-operation party say they will go out, only with the company of the other Southern States, or a part of them. The secessionists say, they desire co-operation, but if they fail to get it, then they think South Carolina should take her rights into her own keeping and secede alone.

The committee propose briefly to examine these two plans of action, and leave it to you, fellow-citizens, to choose which you will take.—You will observe at the outset that the co-operation party, makes the action of South Carolina depend on that of other States. It appears to us, that this is dangerous doctrine. Suppose all the Southern States submit—abandon State sovereignty—then will not South Carolina, her action depending on them, submit too? Unquestionably she will if the doctrine of the co-operation party prevails. And are South Carolinians now, prepared to make the State do what she never has done—submit? But let us examine further. What is co-operation? It is what we all most earnestly desire; we would like for the whole South to go with us; but will they do it?—look to the facts! All of the Southern States, with the single exception of Mississippi, have either submitted to, or acquiesced in, the late outrages of the Federal Government. There is in some of the States a Southern Rights party, but it is a feeble one, and dares not openly advocate secession.—Then since these States have submitted, can we reasonably hope, that they will altar their determination and secede with us. It is almost folly to expect it. In view of this state of affairs, is it wise to make the action of South Carolina depend on that of these States? Does it not amount to this that she like them will submit, and like them be laughed at by our Northern oppressors? If South Carolina has rights and those rights have been trampled on, would it not be better for her to secede alone, relying for success on the strong arms of her sons, and the protection of the God who fought the battles of our forefathers, than basely submit to be robbed of her rights, because other States submit? It is for you to answer the question. But in reply to this, some of the co-operation party will say, they are opposed to submission. We know there are many men in that party who do not intend to submit, but their principles will lead them to it. We feel assured that they are deceiving themselves, and what is far worse, they are acting with those who are at heart submissionists, in deceiving others—deceiving into their ranks men who desire co-operation, but failing to get it, would lose the last drop of blood, rather than South Carolina should become a submission State. But say the co-operationists, or some of them, wait for co-operation a reasonable time, and if we do not get it then, we will secede alone. Are they sincere? These very men will tell you that to secede alone would be suicidal, ruinous, and that South Carolina could not exist as a separate nation. And yet they say, when all reasonable hope of co-operation fails they will secede alone. Can you believe them?—They will, assuredly, not agree to secede alone, under any circumstances, or else they do not believe that separate secession would be ruinous, &c. But further than this: What do they mean by a reasonable time? Do they mean during the existence of the Convention to meet some time next year? If so, we are with them heart and hand. But they do not mean this; that is the platform of the secession party. Some of them will not say what they mean by "*reasonable time*;" others will say five, ten, and even twenty years. A great man once said that liberty might be lost in a day and the fact not be found out for a century. If he had lived in this State, and time, he might have added, "and some people after finding that they have lost it, will wait a century before they try to regain it." Perhaps the shortest way to get at the meaning of the word co-operation, will be to give the definition, given by a candid member of that party—one of the ablest and most honest men in this District. He says he "goes for co-operation, and co-operation means submission."

Let us in the next place examine the doctrine of separate secession. The secession party desire co-operation, and they have been, and are still working to obtain it. To this end the address to the Southern States, by the Convention in May last was written. To this end the central committee appointed by that Convention, has been, and still is laboring. On the other hand, what is the other party doing to get co-operation? Nothing, absolutely nothing! But the secessionists go further, and say that if they fail to get co-operation, then South Carolina should secede alone. And their doctrine is, that the Convention to meet next year, should do all in its power to get the co-operation of other States, but if it should fail, then make ample preparations, and as a last resort, preferable to submission, place South Carolina out of the Union. Now which is the true co-operation, and which the true resistance party? Does not the secession party combine both these qualities; and does it not point out the safest and most honorable course for South Carolina to pursue?

There are several objections urged against separate State secession. There is not one of them founded in good reason. It is said that the secession party are for cutting loose from the Union immediately, without any governmental preparation; and that they do not even so much as desire co-operation. This is all untrue, fellow-citizens, and is said to deceive you into the ranks of the co-operation party. The doctrine of the secession party, we have already stated, and it proves that the secessionists desire co-operation, and the facts show that they are the only party working to obtain it.—The Convention will find it their first and chiefest duty after they have determined to secede, to make governmental preparations. Where then is the objection?

It is further objected, that South Carolina is too small and insignificant to exist as a separate State; and that the people would be burdened with taxes. Wonderful discovery, this. There are in the world, many governments smaller than South Carolina, and they exist, and their people are not half as much oppressed with taxes as we are now, in this glorious Union. By means of the odious Tariff, South Carolina now pays to the support of the federal government about four millions of dollars—less than half of which would defray all additional expense South Carolina would be put to in a separate government.—There is, therefore, no force in the objection. The truth is, fellow-citizens, if our State secedes, we will be less burdened with taxes than we now are. There are other objections, but it would extend too far, the limits of this address, to notice them here. If it should be necessary, it will be done hereafter.

In conclusion, fellow-citizens, let us urge upon you, to support Col. Barnes and Gen. Owens. They are every way qualified for the trust we propose to place in their hands. They advocate the principles of the Secession party as we have laid them down, and if elected they will do all in their power to procure the co-operation of the Southern States.

JOHN W. COOKE,  
JOHN WILLIAMS,  
JAMES ADAMS,  
W. AUGUSTUS MOORE,  
A. AUSTIN.

LANCASTER, Sept. 8th, 1851.

[BY REQUEST.]

From the Winnabow Register.

To Cols. JOHN S. PRESTON and JAMES CHESNUT, Jr. we would present the annexed communication. We do so in this manner, because of the source from whence it emanates. It is from one of our most respected and influential fellow citizens and should, consequently, secure the attention of those gentlemen.

To Cols. Jno. S. Preston, and Jas. Chesnut, Jr. GENTLEMEN—If chosen Deputies to the anticipated Southern Congress will you regard your election as an evidence of the superior numerical strength of the co-operation party in our congressional District.

A SECESSIONIST WHO IS DISPOSED TO VOTE FOR CO-OPERATIONISTS.

COTTON STATEMENT.—There have been received in Charleston during the past week 791 bales, (corresponding week last year 2,430 bales.) Exported in the same time to foreign ports 1,228 bales; coastwise 767 bales; making the total exports of the week 1,995 bales; and leaving on hand a stock of 7,476 bales, inclusive of 2,632 bales on shipboard not cleared, against a stock of 19,110 bales same time last year.

The total receipts since our last report amount to 3,221 bales, (against 1,539 bales same week last year;) making a grand total since the 1st September to the latest dates of 2,341,613 bales, against 2,088,276 bales the same time last year, and 2,739,060 bales the year previous. The total exports to foreign ports amount to 1,986,024 bales, showing an increase of 395,855 bales over those of last year to the same time. The shipments to Northern ports show a falling off of 31,804 bales. The stocks on hand at all the ports are 40,436 bales less than those of last year at the same period.—*Carolinian*.

## TELEGRAPHIC ITEMS.

NEW YORK, Sept. 12.

The Cotton Market is firm; Middling Uplands 9 1-2 to 10; Middling Orleans 9 1-2 a 10 3-4.

The President, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior will visit Boston to participate in the Railroad celebration on Monday.

NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 13.

The sales of Cotton to-day were 1800 bales, at a further advance of 1-8; Middling 8 3-4. The sales of the week were 8,800 bales. Receipts 10,500, against 3,000 last year.

The brig Tehuantepec brings Havana dates to the 6th. One fourth of the prisoners concerned in the Lopez expedition have been released.

SAVANNAH, Sept. 13.

The Pampero has been quietly surrendered to the Collector at Jacksonville, Fla. by Mr. Segier. She was overhauled at sea by the revenue cutter Jackson, but ran up the river St. Johns to Pilatka. The cutter having been reinforced by Lieut. Merchant, with twenty soldiers from St. Augustine, stationed herself with loaded guns at the mouth of the river, when she surrendered.—*Republican*.

A Painful Report.—The Baltimore Sun of Friday says: "We learned late last evening that a telegraphic despatch had been received in this city, announcing that two citizens of Baltimore county, Mr. Edward Gorsuch and Dickinson Gorsuch, his son, had been killed in Pennsylvania, while engaged in the effort to recover a fugitive slave. We were unable to gather particulars in reference to it, but are fearful, from the source from which it comes, that it is too true. We understood the occurrence took place in Chester county. The Messrs. Gorsuch resided about twenty miles from this city, on the York road."

## INFLUENZA, COUGHS, &c.

Those who are troubled with Coughs, Colds, Influenza, or any lung complaint, would do well to try Dr. Roger's Syrup of Liverwort and Tar, which breaks up the most distressing Cough in a few hours' time. Should it fail to do so, the money will be returned.

See advertisement in another column.

## ASTHMA OF THIRTY YEARS STANDING.

Mr. Seth W. Fowle: Sir,—Having been afflicted for more than thirty years with the Asthma, at times so severely as to incapacitate me